

---

Attachment 3.2 B

Market Rate Survey instrument and summary of survey results

## **SURVEY ADMINISTRATION AND DESIGN**

### **Study Background and Objectives for the Survey**

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) working with the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC) at Washington State University conducts a biennial telephone study of childcare providers to determine rates charged for care, the costs associated with running a childcare business, and the availability of childcare across the six DSHS defined regions of the state. The objective of the study is to determine the rates charged by licensed childcare providers. DSHS uses the data gathered to set the amount of money reimbursed to providers caring for children from low-income families for the next two years. This type of study is required by state and federal regulations.

Additional objectives of this research include determining: the availability of childcare in each of six different DSHS administrative regions across the state, the use of certain resources available to centers, how and when the center operates their childcare business, and some of the costs associated with operating a childcare business. Availability is determined by asking questions such as licensed capacity, number of additional children the center would like to care for, and the number of children currently in care. Questions about wages of employees, number of employees and their average years of childcare experience, as well as questions on monthly rent and utility expenses are asked to determine the cost of running the business. Some questions asking when the center is open to provide childcare are asked to determine when the center operates and questions about collection of fees and co-pays

For purposes of accurately collecting and analyzing data, the study is separated into two distinct forms of childcare: licensed in-home family childcare providers, which are usually owned and operated by a single individual, and licensed childcare centers. This report documents the procedures used and presents the results for the licensed childcare centers survey. (The licensed in-home family childcare providers study procedures and results can be found in SESRC data report #06-29)

### **Population and Sample**

The population consisted of 2092 childcare centers licensed in the State of Washington as of January 1, 2006. A major goal of the study is to determine childcare rates and availability by regions of the state, and since the population total is under 2,200 centers, all childcare centers in the state are included in the survey.

The previous surveys we have conducted showed that the childcare center population should be administered differently for each of two main groups; single centers, and multiple-site centers. Multiple-site centers are those that have several locations but one central mailing address, or one director overseeing several centers. These multiple-sites tend to charge the same rates for childcare and pay the same wages to employees. Since the majority of the questions gather this information, the study can be repetitive and time-consuming for these directors. Therefore, these directors tend to complete the survey in one of two ways: answer for all of their sites at one time, combining information on numbers of employees and children; or answer for only one or two centers, refusing to answer any questions for their other sites. Therefore, SESRC and DSHS have worked hard to reduce the burden of completing the survey for multiple-site directors. Since design and implementation of the study differed for the two groups, throughout the rest of this report some sections will include separate information for the single center and multiple-site centers.

DSHS provided a list of childcare centers in Washington State. SESRC staff reviewed the sample for duplicates, and found none. Staff members then reviewed the sample for possible multiple-site centers, that is centers with five or more sites with the same director name, mailing address, phone number, or provider number. In addition, SESRC reviewed multiple-site information from the 2004 study to check if the sites identified in this study as multiples matched. SESRC identified 437 sites as being part of 40 multiple-site centers; referred to as "lead centers". Identified multiple-site centers were removed to their own file. An association number was created and added as a field in the file in order to determine which sites belonged together.

Since the study included the entire population, as contacts were made the number in the population changed. For instance, some centers (35) had closed between when the licensing information was pulled in January and the time calling started in March.

### **Interview Design**

This study is conducted every two years. In past years the study was conducted by telephone only. In 2004 and again in 2006 DSHS decided to offer the sampled providers three methods (modes) of participation: a telephone version; an on-line, web (Internet) version; and a written, self-administered (mailed) questionnaire (offered only to multiple-site center directors).

Each mode contained similar questions, with only minor wording differences that were mostly based on whether the survey would be heard (phone) or seen (internet and mailed). Additionally, questions pertaining to the directors opinion were removed from the mailed survey, since each site is treated as an individual center, and data entered individually. The web site was designed and deployed by DSHS staff members (Steve Rowswell and Laura Schrager) but hosted on the SESRC web server.

As in past studies, DSHS staff members compared previous studies to determine changes to the interview script. DSHS then forwards these changes to SESRC staff. SESRC uses these changes to update the CATI program from the previous study.

Questions that did not change from previous studies included: age groups cared for (infants under 1 year old, toddlers from 1 up to 2 ½ years, preschoolers, kindergartners, and school-age children); monthly charge for full-time care (25 or more hours per week) and number of children cared for by each age group; number of part-time children cared for; number of full-time and part-time summer school-age children in care, if any; number of DSHS children cared for during the last typical week; if there is a limit on the number of DSHS children, and reasons for setting that limit, or not providing care to DSHS children; the number of additional children the provider would like to care for, and how many of those vacancies were available in each age group; the total number of volunteers and employees, then a series of questions, including number (and number hired after September 1, 2005), wage, and years of paid childcare experience for each of four groups of employees: assistants or aides, teachers, program supervisors, and directors; if benefits such as sick leave, vacation leave, or medical insurance is provided to teachers; the licensed capacity of the center; type of center; number of times a licensor was contacted and the length of time the licensor took to return contacts; years of operation, both in total and under current ownership; monthly rent or mortgage and utility costs; the location of the center; and computer internet usage.

Changes made to questions essentially involved re-wording questions to make them easier for the provider to understand and DSHS to analyze. One major change involved removing several questions asked in the 2004 study. One such deletion was the section of questions regarding reasons why children have left. Additional deletions included: usefulness of "The Link" quarterly publication, use of license processing assistance and mini-grants from Resource and Referral, if the provider had problems with local zoning; questions referring to the DSHS "Child Care Subsidies" booklet and inadvertent deletion of provider demographic questions such as level of education, and race and ethnicity. These questions were replaced with an expanded series of questions about contacts with a licensor and licensing regulations, including an open ended question asking for suggestions to improve DCCEL.

## **SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCEDURES**

### **Human Subject Review**

SESRC submitted the project design and questionnaire to the Institutional Review Board at Washington State University (WSU-IRB) for review of human subjects procedures and compliance with federal regulations. Approval was received on February 21, 2006 (IRB #8987).

### **Progression of the Survey**

#### **Prior Notification.**

Different mailings, reply cards or forms, and survey protocol were implemented based on whether the site was part of the single center group or the multiple-site group.

#### *Single Center Prior Notification*

Staff members at DSHS finalized the prior letter and worksheet. The prior letter informed the respondent that a survey was being conducted, the reasons for the study, and the expected length. It informed respondents that their responses were voluntary and confidential, and that an on-line version of the survey was available at [www.sesrc.wsu.edu/childcare](http://www.sesrc.wsu.edu/childcare). In addition, the letter told directors that returning the enclosed reply card or completing the web survey would enter the center in a drawing for a \$50.00 grocery gift certificate. All letters were printed on DSHS stationery and placed in DSHS envelopes.

The worksheet included with the letter gave the respondent an opportunity to prepare for the survey in advance. It contained questions that may require research by the respondent, such as number of children and monthly rates for each age group, as well as number of employees, their average wage, and number of years of paid childcare experience in each of four groups (aides or assistants, teachers, program supervisors, and directors). Additionally, it contained short answer questions such as rent and utility expenses, vacancies by age group, and the number of school-age children expected in summer care.

SESRC staff drafted and finalized a reply card that was included with the prior letter. The reply card allowed the director to update their phone number and request the time they would prefer to be called. The card also included a check box, allowing the director to indicate that they no longer provided childcare. A business reply envelope was included for return of the reply card.

SESRC printed all documents, and assembled the mailing. These were shipped to DSHS in Olympia by Federal Express on February 24, 2006 and were processed and mailed from DSHS offices.

### *Multiple-Site Prior Notification*

Each lead center received a prior notification addressed to the person listed as the director most often in the population file and mailed to the most frequently listed mailing address. While the letter disclosed the same information about the study, instead of a reply card, the enclosure was a reply form listing all sites identified by SESRC as part of that multiple-site center. The reply form was in table format listing the site name, physical address, phone number, and director name. The letter and form requested that the lead center director review the information for each site, indicate any changes, note if the site was closed or not part of the group, and add any sites not listed on the form. The lead center director could also choose to have the study conducted by phone, mail, or have each site completed individually by a site director. The lead center director was asked to return the form by May 10, 2006; otherwise each individual site listed on the form would be contacted directly. While the multiple-site letters were printed on DSHS letterhead, the mailings were sent from SESRC in Pullman. SESRC received a total of 21 replies (out of 38 sent) but only 15 before the May 10, 2006 cut-off. Of these replies, all 15 requested a written survey. Additionally, 1 director indicated that a total of 10 sites were part of a different grouping and requested a written survey.

**Translation.** No translations were prepared, since the childcare center portion of the overall study can be conducted with any center employee knowledgeable about charges, expenses, type of center, and so on.

**On-Line.** A department of Social and Health Services staff member programmed the web survey. The site was deployed on SESRC's web server on March 8, 2006.

**Interviewer Training.** The project training for interviewers was held on March 13, 2006, and additional training sessions were held as needed throughout the data collection period to clarify interviewing circumstances or to train new interviewers. All interviewers selected to work on this project received a minimum of 6 hours of basic interviewer training and an additional hour of project specific training. The project training included background information, purpose of the study, definitions, and a review of the questions and content of the survey. In addition, interviewers practiced for approximately one hour on the CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) program before calling actual providers. At all times during the course of training and project calling, one or more supervisors were available to provide quality control and to respond to interviewers' needs and questions. A total of 18 interviewers and 3 staff members were trained and called on this project.

## **Telephone Interviews**

### *Single Centers*

Calling on the single centers began on March 13, 2006 and was completed on May 16, 2006. While most cases were finished within 13 call attempts (completed, refused, disconnected, etc), some cases did receive additional attempts, with a maximum of 25 call attempts. Call attempts alternated by day of the week and time of day, with a majority of calling done between 8:00 in the morning and 5:00 in the afternoon on weekdays. If an interviewer called at an inconvenient time for the center, they would reschedule a specific time to re-contact the center for an interview. The average completed interview length was 21.6 minutes.

One situation that arises every year on the Childcare Center portion of the Childcare Rates and Resources study is directors completing for all their sites under only one case. The population that DSHS sends to SESRC for use in the study is a licensing database – therefore if a center has two separate buildings housing different age groups, the center has two licenses. Or, there may be one director / owner with two centers, but only one bookkeeping system for rates and number of employees. Frequently these directors prefer to answer both (or all) sites at one time, and do not inform SESRC interviewers that the data includes more than one site until the other site is called – usually on a different date. 17 of the 790 single center completes listed in the response rate table on page 13, include data for two or more site. A total of 52 sites were completed under an affiliated site.

Additionally, 36 single centers identified themselves as part of a multiple site group prior to completing the phone survey, and requested a mailed questionnaire. These 9 lead centers indicated they had between two and four sites each, totaling 72 sites. All of these centers were sent the multiple site prior notification mailing.

### *Multiple Site Centers*

SESRC used the same CATI program for multiple-site centers as was used for the single sites, assigning the cases a unique range of identification numbers. Calling on multiple site centers consisted solely of contacting each site for the lead centers that did not return their multiple-site reply form, and contacting those multiple-site lead directors that requested on the reply form that each site complete the survey individually; essentially, treating each as a single center survey. Calling on these sites began on June 15, 2006 and finished on June 19, 2006. Most cases were finished within three call attempts (completed, refused, disconnected, etc). Call attempts alternated by day of the week and time of day, with a majority of calling done between 8:00 in the morning and 5:00 in the

afternoon on weekdays. If an interviewer called at an inconvenient time for the center, they would reschedule a specific time to re-contact the center for an interview. A total of 269 multiple sites were contacted individually, with 1 site completing the phone survey.

**Interviewer Monitoring.** To maintain data quality and continuity in the telephone data collection process, interviewer performance was regularly monitored and measured. SESRC's current standard is to monitor all interviewers at least once a week during a day or night shift. One of the main purposes of monitoring is to minimize interviewer effects. Interviewers are scored on specific factors that measure proper interviewing techniques. The two principles that guide the training and scoring of interviews are: (1) respondents should receive information that is delivered by the interviewer in an unbiased manner; and (2) every respondent should receive the same stimulus from each interviewer. These principles translate into five basic interviewing rules that are used as factors by the monitor for scoring an interview:

- Rule 1: The reading of each question is exactly as it is written and in the order in which it appears in the questionnaire.
- Rule 2: A slow reading pace.
- Rule 3: Standard neutral feedback phrases such as "Thank you. That's important information" or "I see" are given as acceptable responses.
- Rule 4: Standard neutral cues or probes such as "Could you tell me more about that" or "Which would be closer to the way you feel?" are given to the respondent to help him/her give more complete answers to questions.
- Rule 5: Accurate recording of all responses.

Approximately 80 interviews (10.13% of all 790 completed) were monitored over the duration of the data collection period.



### **Self-Administered Questionnaires-Multiple site centers only**

The self-administered questionnaire design incorporated tables where all sites could be answered individually if the sites differed, or as a group – by using quotes, arrows, or “same” – if all sites had the same information. The questions matched the telephone and web survey questions, both in order and in wording, except for the removal of a few questions that would be difficult to analyze if asked only once, but did not make sense to ask for each site. One example was the series of questions referring to contacts with a licensor and licensing regulations.

The questionnaire was customized for each lead center into an 11 x 17 booklet. If the lead center indicated there were a total of 12 sites, the names of those 12 sites became rows in each table in the questionnaire, but if the center only had two sites, the table only contained two rows. The mailing included a cover letter giving instructions on how to fill out the questionnaire, and the deadline for returning the questionnaire.

Since there were several methods of requesting a mailed survey, mailings went out in two groups. Each group consisted of three contacts: the prior notification letter and worksheet, the first questionnaire and cover letter, and then a phone follow-up to non-respondents. The phone follow-up encompassed two separate types of contacts: a simple reminder, or an actual survey call. If the center had returned the worksheet and requested a mail questionnaire, the phone contact was simply a reminder to encourage return of the questionnaire. If the center was part of a multiple-site center that did not return the reply form or requested individual site contacts, then the phone contact became an actual survey call – requesting the site complete the survey over the phone or on-line individually. Messages were left on answering machines or with other staff members if the director was not available.

The mailing packet was placed in a 10 x 13 envelope and included the questionnaire booklet, a cover letter, and a prestamped 9 x 12 return envelope with SESRC's address. First questionnaire mailings began on May 12, 2006 for the first group and May 15, 2006 for the second. A date of May 30, 2006 was requested for completing and returning questionnaires sent to the first group; this date moved to June 2nd for the second group.

Final contacts – in the form of the phone follow-up calls (both reminder and survey calls) – were conducted June 12, 2006 through June 19, 2006. In total, 15 centers received the written survey, encompassing a total of 186 sites. Response rates were better than expected, with 9 completed questionnaires returned (60% of those mailed), which covered 124 sites (66.67% of all sites in the mailings).

## **Data Entry and Data Management**

All interviews were conducted from the Public Opinion Laboratory (POL) of SESRC using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system from the Voxco Company. The CATI system displays survey questions on a computer monitor from which the interviewer can read the question to the respondent and then enter the response directly into the CATI database for storage on the server computer. Data files were collected at the conclusion of the survey and archived to CD-ROM for permanent storage at SESRC.

## CASE DISPOSITION AND RESPONSE RATES

### Response Rates

Three kinds of response rates for the fielded sample were calculated from the number of completed interviews obtained and are presented in Table 2. The **cooperation rate** is the ratio of the number of completed and partially completed interviews plus ineligibles to the number of completed, partially completed, ineligibles and refusal cases. The formula for calculating the cooperation rate is:

$$\frac{(CM+PC)}{[(CM+PC)+RF]}$$

where CM = number of completed interviews  
PC = number of partially completed interviews  
RF = number of refusals

The cooperation rate was 88.34% (including web completes and partials- 1349/1527) and 84.48% (phone only – 969/1147) for the random sample.

The **response rate** is the ratio of the number of completed and partially completed interviews, to the number of completed, partially completed, eligible non-interviews and unknown eligibility non-interviews. The formula for calculating the response rate is:

$$\frac{(CM+PC)}{[(CM+PC) + RF + EN + UE]}$$

where CM = number of completed interviews  
PC = number of partially completed interviews  
RF = number of refusals  
EN = number of eligible, non-interview  
UE = number of unknown eligible, non-interview

For the total fielded sample, the response rate was 68.3% (with web – 1349/1975) and 60.75% (phone only – 969/1595)

The **adjusted response rate** is the ratio of the number of completed and partially completed interviews, to the total number of potential respondents who are deemed eligible to complete the interview. The formula for calculating the adjusted response rate is:

$$\frac{(CM+PC)}{[(CM+PC) + RF + EN + (\% \text{eligible} * UE)]}$$

where CM = number of completed interviews  
PC = number of partially completed interviews  
RF = number of refusals  
EN = number of eligible, non-interview  
% Eligible  
UE = number of unknown eligible, non-interview

For this survey, a conservative estimate of ineligibility was applied. The calculation looks at the know ineligibles divided by the total sample. Thus the proportion of the fielded sample found to be eligible was 94.41% (1-(117/2092)) and was presumed to hold among the potential respondents who could be neither interviewed nor reached.

**Table 1. Total Sample Disposition**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Cases</b>
<b>Eligible, Interviewed</b>	
Completed Telephone Interviews	790
Partially Completed Telephone/Written Interviews	14
Completed Telephone Survey under an affiliated Site	52
Completed Mail Questionnaire	113
Web Completes	353
Partially Completed Web Interviews	27
<b>Eligible, Non-Interview, provider reached</b>	
Refusal and break off	178
Non-Contact	185
Respondent Never Available	20
Physically or mentally unable /incompetent	1
Terminated Interview	0
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview, provider not reached</b>	
Always busy	12
No answer	35
Telephone answer machine	189
Telecommunication tech barriers	1
No screener complete due to language	5
<b>Known Ineligible, provider reached</b>	
No longer or never a child care provider	35
Summer only program	18
Disconnected / wrong numbers	18
Other (duplicate numbers)	40
Fax/Data line	2
Temporarily out of service	4
Total sample fielded	2092
<b>Rate Calculations</b>	
<b>Cooperation Rate</b> (Completes + Partial Completes)/(Completes + Partial Completes+ Refusals)	88.34% (with web) 84.48%(phone and mail only)
<b>Response Rate</b> (Completes + Partial Completes)/Completes + Partial Completes + Known Eligible + Unknown Eligible)	68.3%(with web) 60.75%(phoneand mail only)
<b>E</b> Estimated proportion of cases not reached that would be eligible based on calling experience. (1-(known ineligible/total sample))	94.41%
<b>Adjusted Response Rate</b> (Completes + Partial Completes)/(Completes + Partial Completes+ Refusals + (e * Unknown Eligible not reached cases) + Known Eligible)	69.14% (with web) 61.68%(phone and mail only)

## Sampling Error

Sampling error is a measure of the degree to which a randomly selected sample of respondents represents the population from which it is drawn. Sampling error also is the basis upon which tests of statistical significance are calculated. One formula for calculating the sampling error for a proportion at the 95 percent confidence level is presented below, and this can be used to calculate the sampling error for survey results in this report.

$$SE = 2\sqrt{\frac{pq}{(n-1)}\left(\frac{N-n}{N}\right)}$$

Where: SE= sample error

p = proportion of "yes" responses for a specific question = 0.50

q = proportion of "no" responses for a specific question = 0.50

n = sample size = number of completed interviews for a specific questions

N = population size for the survey

In this study, the total population of all daycare Centers in Washington State was included in the sample. Since every sample member had an equal opportunity of participating no sampling error exists.

## **SURVEY ADMINISTRATION AND DESIGN**

### **Study Background and Objectives for the Survey**

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) working with the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC) at Washington State University conducts a biennial telephone study of childcare providers to determine rates charged for care, the costs associated with running a childcare business, and the availability of childcare across the six DSHS defined regions of the state. The objective of the study is to determine the rates charged by licensed childcare providers. DSHS uses the data gathered to set the amount of money reimbursed to providers caring for children from low-income families for the next two years. This type of study is required by federal regulation.

Additional objectives included determining: the availability of childcare in each of six different DSHS administrative regions across the state, the use of certain resources available to providers, how and when the provider operates their childcare business, and some of the costs associated with operating a childcare business. Availability is determined by asking questions such as licensed capacity, number of additional children the provider would like to care for, and the number of children currently in care. Questions about wages of assistants, number of hours worked, and gross income are asked to determine cost of running the business. Simple questions asking when the provider is open to provide childcare are asked to determine when the provider operates and questions about collection of fees and co-pays.

For purposes of accurately collecting and analyzing data, the study is separated into two distinct forms of childcare: licensed in-home family childcare providers, which are usually owned and operated by a single individual, and licensed childcare centers. This report documents the procedures used and presents the results for the in-home family childcare providers survey. (The licensed childcare centers procedures and results can be found in SESRC data report #06-28)

### **Population and Sample**

The population for the 2006 study consisted of 5767 providers licensed in the state of Washington to provide in-home childcare as of January 2006. DSHS selected a stratified random sample of 2196 licensed providers. The sample was selected in direct proportion to the number of licensed providers within the region of the state, unless there were fewer than a set number of providers in a given region in which case all providers from that region were included in the sample; when this happened, proportions in other regions were adjusted lower in order to keep the sample under 2,200 providers.

## **Interview Design**

This study is conducted every two years. In past years the study was conducted by telephone only. Again in 2006 DSHS decided to offer the sampled providers two methods (modes) of participation: a telephone version and an on-line, web (Internet) version. Each mode contained similar questions, with only minor wording differences that were mostly based on whether the survey would be heard (phone) or seen (internet). The web site was designed and deployed by DSHS staff but hosted on the SESRC web server.

As in past studies, DSHS staff compared previous studies to determine changes to the interview script. DSHS then forwards these changes to SESRC staff. SESRC uses these changes to update the CATI program from the previous study. Since the previous study CATI is used, the Spanish translation from the previous study is also kept and modified to reflect the changes sent by DSHS.

Questions that did not change from previous studies included: number of children in care; number of DSHS children cared for during the last typical week; a series of questions about each child cared for (up to 25 children), including age (in months if under 3 years), number of days cared for in a typical week, number of hours cared for, weekly charge, and if the child's care was subsidized by DSHS; the number of additional children the provider would like to care for, and how many of these vacancies were for children under 2 years old; if the provider received assistance from the USDA food program; if the childcare is covered by liability insurance; the gross earnings in 2005, and if these earnings were the provider's primary source of income; the number of years as a provider and how many more years the provider plans to care for children; the licensed capacity; number of times a licensor was contacted and the length of time the licensor took to return contacts; computer internet usage; a series of questions about assistants, if any, such as how many hours they assist, and how much the assistant is paid; and a final question on if the provider has their own medical insurance.

Several questions asked in the 2004 study were removed for the 2006 study. One of the major deletions was the section of questions regarding reasons why children have left. Additional deletions included: usefulness of "The Link" quarterly publication, use of license processing assistance and mini-grants from Resource and Referral, if the provider had problems with local zoning; questions referring to the DSHS "Child Care Subsidies" booklet and inadvertent deletion of provider demographic questions such as level of education, and race and ethnicity. These questions were replaced with a series of questions about contacts with a licensor, including an open ended question asking for suggestions to improve DCCEL.



## **SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCEDURES**

**Human Subject Review.** SESRC submitted the project design and questionnaire to the Institutional Review Board at Washington State University (WSU-IRB) for review of human subjects procedures and compliance with federal regulations. Approval was received on February 21, 2006 (IRB #8988).

### **Progression of the Survey**

**Prior Notification.** Staff members at DSHS finalized the prior letter and worksheet. The prior letter informed the respondent the study would be conducted again this year, the reasons for the study, and the expected length of the completing either the phone or on-line version of the survey. It informed providers their responses were voluntary and confidential. In addition, the letter included the URL for completing the on-line version of the survey. All letters were printed using DSHS stationary and out-going envelopes.

The worksheet included with the letter gave the respondent an opportunity to prepare for the survey in advance. It contained questions that may require research by the respondent, such as information on each child cared for, including their age, number of hours in care per week, weekly charge for care, and if a DSHS subsidized the child. In addition, there were questions about their 2005 gross earnings from the childcare business, number of hours spent in childcare related activities, and the number of additional children the provider would like to care for.

SESRC staff drafted and finalized a reply card that was included with the prior letter. The reply card allowed the respondent to update their phone number and request the time they would prefer to be called. The card also included a check box, allowing the respondent to indicate that they no longer provided childcare. A business reply envelope with SESRC's address was also included for return of the reply card.

All documents were translated into Spanish by an SESRC translator, and copied to the reverse side of the English document.

SESRC printed all documents, and assembled the mailing. These were shipped to DSHS in Olympia by Federal Express on March 6, 2006 and were processed and mailed from DSHS offices on March 8, 2006.

**Translation.** The questionnaire was translated into Spanish using standard translate / back-translate procedures. Standard procedures include having a translator, fluent in Spanish, translate the English language questionnaire into Spanish. A second translator translates the Spanish language questionnaire back into English. If there is a discrepancy, the back-translator (Spanish to

English) marks the discrepancy. The discrepancies are then reviewed and a solution is arbitrated between the translators and the Study Director. In addition to translating any changes made to the telephone interview, all prior mailing materials – the cover letter, worksheet, and reply card were translated.

**On-Line.** A department of Social and Health Services staff member programmed the web survey. This year, the online version was translated into Spanish.

**Interviewer Training.** The project training for interviewers was held on March 22, 2006, and additional training sessions were held as needed throughout the data collection period to clarify interviewing circumstances or to train new interviewers. All interviewers selected to work on this project received a minimum of 6 hours of basic interview training and an additional hour of project specific training. The project training included background information, purpose of the study, definitions, and a review of the questions and content of the survey. In addition, interviewers practiced between for approximately one hour on the CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) program before calling actual providers. At all times during the course of training and project calling, one or more supervisors were available to provide quality control and to respond to interviewers' needs and questions. A total of 16 interviewers and 3 staff members were trained and called on this project.

**Telephone Interviews.** The calling on the full study commenced on March 22, 2006 and was completed on May 31, 2006. All active cases received a minimum of 25 call attempts, with the exception of cases that were scheduled for a hard call back. If an interviewer called at an inconvenient time for the respondent, the interviewer would attempt to schedule a specific time to re-contact the provider for an interview. The average interview length for a completed interview was 21 minutes.

**Interviewer Monitoring.** To maintain data quality and continuity in the telephone data collection process, interviewer performance was regularly monitored and measured. SESRC's current standard is to monitor all interviewers at least once a week during a day or night shift. One of the main purposes of monitoring is to minimize interviewer effects. Interviewers are scored on specific factors that measure proper interviewing techniques. The two principles that guide the training and scoring of interviews are: (1) providers should receive information that is delivered by the interviewer in a neutral, non-biased manner; and (2) every interviewer needs to provide each respondent the same stimulus. These principles translate into five basic interviewing rules that are used as factors by the monitor for scoring an interview:

- Rule 1: The reading of each question is exactly as it is written and in the order in which it appears in the questionnaire.
- Rule 2: A slow reading pace.
- Rule 3: Standard neutral feedback phrases such as "Thank you. That's important information" or "I see" are given intermittently throughout the survey to encourage continued participation.
- Rule 4: Standard neutral cues or probes such as "Could you tell me more about that" or "Which would be closer to the way you feel?" are given to the respondent to help him / her give more complete answers to questions.
- Rule 5: Accurate recording of all responses.

Approximately 62 interviews (6.6% of completed telephone interviews) were monitored over the twelve weeks of data collection.

**Refusal Conversions.** The purpose of refusal conversions is to improve the response rates for the study and decrease the non-response error. For this survey refusal conversions were not conducted per request of DSHS staff.

### **Data Entry and Data Management**

All interviews were conducted from the Public Opinion Laboratory (POL) of SESRC using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system from Voxco. The CATI system displays survey questions on a computer monitor from which the interviewer can read the question to the respondent and then enter the response directly into the CATI database for storage on a server computer. Data files were collected at the conclusion of the survey and archived to CD-ROM for permanent storage at SESRC.

## CASE DISPOSITIONS AND RESPONSE RATES

### Response Rates

Three kinds of response rates for the fielded sample were calculated from the number of completed interviews obtained and are presented in Table 1.

The **cooperation rate** is the ratio of the number of completed and partially completed interviews to the number of completed, partially completed, and refusal cases. The formula for calculating the cooperation rate is:

$$\frac{(CM+PC)}{[(CM+PC+RF)]}$$

Where CM = number of completed interviews  
PC = number of partially completed interviews  
RF = number of refusals

The cooperation rate was 79.23%% (including web completes and partials- 1259/1589) and 74.33% (phone only – 956/1286) for the random sample.

The **response rate** is the ratio of the number of completed and partially completed interviews, to the number of completed, partially completed, eligible non-interviews and unknown eligibility non-interviews. Eligibility is based on the provided indicating whether or not they currently provide childcare. The formula for calculating the response rate is:

$$\frac{(CM+PC)}{[(CM+PC) + RF + EN + UE]}$$

Where CM = number of completed interviews  
PC = number of partially completed interviews  
RF = number of refusals  
EN = number of eligible, non-interview  
UE = number of unknown eligible, non-interview

For the total fielded sample, the response rate was 65.09% (with web – 1259/1934 ) and 58.61% (phone only – 959/1631)

The **adjusted response rate** is the ratio of the number of completed and partially completed interviews, to the total number of potential respondents who are deemed eligible to complete the interview. The formula for calculating the adjusted response rate is:

$$\frac{(CM+PC)}{[(CM+PC) + RF + EN + (\% \text{eligible} * UE)]}$$

Where CM = number of completed interviews

PC = number of partially completed interviews

RF = number of refusals

EN = number of eligible, non-interview

% Eligible

UE = number of unknown eligible, non-interview

For this survey, a conservative estimate of ineligibility was applied: the proportion of the fielded sample found to be eligible was 88.07% (1-(262/2196) and was presumed to hold among the potential respondents who could be neither interviewed nor reached. The adjusted response rate for the field sample, with 88.07% of the unknown eligible cases assumed to be eligible was 66.26% (with web) and 59.85% (phone only).

**Table 1. Total Sample Disposition**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Cases</b>
<b>Eligible, Interviewed</b>	
Completed Telephone Interviews	940
Partially Completed Telephone Interviews	16
Web Completes	287
Partially Completed Web Interviews	16
<b>Eligible, Non-Interview, provider reached</b>	
Refusal and break off	330
Non-Contact	32
Respondent Never Available	4
Physically or mentally unable /incompetent	1
Terminated Interview	0
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview, provider not reached</b>	
Always busy	8
No answer	60
Telephone answer machine	208
Telecommunication tech barriers	2
No screener complete due to language	30
<b>Known Ineligible, provider reached</b>	
No longer or never a child care provider	193
Deceased	1
Disconnected / wrong numbers	45
Other (self identified duplicate numbers)	16
Fax/Data line	3
Temporarily out of service	4
Total sample fielded	2196
<b>Rate Calculations</b>	
<b>Cooperation Rate</b> (Completes + Partial Completes)/(Completes + Partial Completes+ Refusals)	79.23% (with web) 74.33%(phone only)
<b>Response Rate</b> (Completes + Partial Completes)/Completes + Partial Completes + Known Eligible + Unknown Eligible)	65.09%(with web) 58.61%(phone only)
<b>E</b> Estimated proportion of cases not reached that would be eligible based on calling experience. (1-(known ineligible/total sample))	88.07%
<b>Adjusted Response Rate</b> (Completes + Partial Completes)/(Completes + Partial Completes+ Refusals + (e * Unknown Eligible not reached cases) + Known Eligible)	66.26%(with web) 59.85%(phone only)

## Sampling Error

Sampling error is a measure of the degree to which a randomly selected sample of respondents represents the population from which it is drawn. Sampling error also is the basis upon which tests of statistical significance are calculated. One formula for calculating the sampling error for a proportion at the 95 percent confidence level is presented below, and this can be used to calculate the sampling error for survey results in this report.

$$SE = 2\sqrt{\frac{pq}{(n-1)}\left(\frac{N-n}{N}\right)}$$

Where: SE= sample error

p = proportion of "yes" responses for a specific question = 0.50

q = proportion of "no" responses for a specific question = 0.50

n = sample size = number of completed interviews for a specific questions

N = population size for the survey

For this survey, completed interviews were obtained from 1225 (both phone and web) of 5767 licensed in-home child care providers in the state of Washington, yielding a margin of error of about  $\pm 2.5$  percentage points at the 95 percent confidence level.